

The Quark-Hadron Phase Transition, QCD Lattice Calculations and Inhomogeneous Big-Bang Nucleosynthesis

A.A. Coley and T. Trappenberg

Department of Mathematics, Statistics and Computing Science

Dalhousie University
Halifax, N.S., B3H 3J5, Canada

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We review recent lattice QCD results for the surface tension at the finite temperature quark-hadron phase transition and discuss their implications on the possible scale of inhomogeneities. In the quenched approximation the average distance between nucleating centers is smaller than the diffusion length of a proton, so that inhomogeneities are washed out by the time nucleosynthesis sets in. Consequently the baryon density fluctuations formed by a QCD phase transition in the early universe cannot significantly affect standard big-bang nucleosynthesis calculations and certainly cannot allow baryons to close the universe. At present lattice results are inconclusive when dynamical fermions are included.

1 Introduction

The density of luminous matter is $\Omega_L \sim 0.01$ (to within a factor of two) and the density of clustered matter needed to account for the stability of galaxies or large-scale motions is $\Omega_G \sim 0.1 - 0.2$. Also, inflation predicts that $\Omega \sim \Omega_c = 1$, where Ω_c is the critical density for closure (Ω is the ratio of the present density to the critical density of the universe). However, standard (homogeneous density) big-bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) calculations constrain the ratio of the present baryon density to Ω_c by $0.01 \leq \Omega_B \leq 0.15$ [1] (where uncertainties in the value of the Hubble parameter are included). While the value of Ω_B is consistent with Ω_G , if $\Omega \sim 1$ then the majority of matter in the universe is non-baryonic (consisting of, for example, axions, WIMPS, massive neutrinos, etc.).

Recently the physics of the quark-hadron phase transition has been of much interest (cf. Reeves [2] and references therein). Of particular interest, from an astrophysical point of view, is the suggestion that (large) baryon density fluctuations are formed by QCD phase transitions which occur in the early universe [3], that will then affect BBN calculations [4, 5]. In particular, initial calculations indicated that the upper bound on Ω_B from BBN might be relaxed and it was suggested that $\Omega_B \sim 1$ might be reconciled with observations [6, 7]. We shall discuss inhomogeneous BBN in section 2.

However, many parameters of the quark-hadron phase transition are poorly known, and extensive QCD calculations on networks are necessary to determine the affects of inhomogeneous BBN more accurately. In section 3 recent results from QCD lattice calculations will be reviewed. The consequences for BBN and the constraints on Ω_B will be briefly discussed in the concluding section.

2 Primordial Nucleosynthesis

The cosmological implications of the quark-hadron phase transition arises from the fact that it may induce baryon density inhomogeneities in the cosmic fluid, thereby producing inhomogeneities in the ratio of neutrons to protons which then modify the abundances of the light elements obtained in the standard (homogeneous) BBN calculations. Larger values of Ω_B than in the baryon-homogeneous cosmologies are allowed, since in both proton-rich and neutron-rich regions the burning of neutrons and protons through D up to ${}^4\text{He}$ is less efficient (for larger baryon densities) and at later times (when sufficient neutrons have decayed) the temperature is lower and the subsequent burning of D is less efficient (than in the homogeneous case in both cases) resulting in relatively less ${}^4\text{He}$ being made in both neutron and proton-rich regions but relatively greater amounts of D (and other heavier elements) being made in the neutron-rich regions.

Assuming that the phase transition is first order, the new phase is not reached immediately; the system is cooled through the critical temperature T_c , but overcooling occurs in which fluctuations create small volumes of the new phase [8]. The nucleated bubbles of the hadronic phase then expand in the quark-gluon phase with the velocity of light in the quark-gluon plasma $v_s = 1/\sqrt{3}$. The shock wave will then reheat the plasma, so that no further nucleation occurs. The scale of the inhomogeneities produced at the quark-hadron phase transition within this simple bubble nucleation scenario is given by the mean separation of the nucleating centers l . Assuming that the phase transition occurs within thermodynamic equilibrium, the mean distance between nucleating centers has been estimated by Meyer *et al.* [9] to be (in terms of the inverse Hubble time H)

$$l \times H \approx 4.38 \frac{(0.4)^3 \sqrt{3}}{32\pi} \left[\frac{\alpha}{T_c^3} \right]^{3/2} \left[\frac{L}{T_c^4} \right]^{-1}, \quad (1)$$

which depends on the QCD parameters L (the latent heat) and α (the surface tension, which is the surface energy density of the hadronized bubbles). With the inclusion of the quark degree of freedoms the temperature dependent Hubble time was estimated to be [10]

$$H^{-1} = \frac{3}{\sqrt{164\pi^3}} \frac{M_{Pl}}{T^2}, \quad (2)$$

with the Planck mass $M_{Pl} = 2 \times 10^{19} GeV$, so that the scale of inhomogeneities can be further reduced to

$$l \approx 8 \times 10^5 m \left[\frac{\alpha}{T_c^3} \right]^{3/2} \left[\frac{L}{T_c^4} \right]^{-1} [T_c / (MeV)]^{-2}. \quad (3)$$

QCD estimates of T_c indicate that $T_c = 200 \pm 50 MeV$ in the quenched approximation of QCD [11] and $T_c = 80 \pm 20 MeV$ with four flavours of light quarks [12]. Estimates for l have been discussed by various authors [9, 13, 14], although within the uncertainties of the QCD parameters in the original calculations l could range, in principle, from zero to relatively large values. A better estimate for l must therefore come from detailed quantum lattice theory calculations.

The universe cools from the quark-hadron phase transition at T_c until the time of BBN at T_N ($t_N \sim 1 \text{sec}$), by which time antimatter has disappeared. Before t_N the neutron-to-proton ratio is governed by weak interactions (and given by the Boltzmann formula), but for $t > 1 \text{sec}$ the weak processes are no longer in thermal equilibrium. Neutrons diffuse from high baryon-density phases to low-density phases, changing both their density and their neutron-to-proton ratio, so that by T_N high-density proton-rich regions and lower-density neutron-rich regions would exist, thereby affecting nucleosynthetic yields [4]. The extent of neutron diffusion is a function of l (and the fractional volume of the high-density phase, f_v). The smaller the value of l the less the effect of inhomogeneities, and so for significant changes to nucleosynthetic yields a large value of l is necessary. For example, within a typical model one would need an l in the range of $l \sim 5 - 150 m$ to get $\Omega \geq 0.15$, (cf. [9]).

Many authors [4, 5, 7, 9, 13, 15, 16] have estimated numerically the nucleosynthetic yields based on various physical models and approximations (e.g., 2-64 zone models, whether or not neutron and proton diffusion is taken into account before BBN, and so on) and various values for the QCD parameters, particularly to determine whether the observed abundances of the light nuclides D, ^3He , ^4He , ^7Li [1, 17] can be reconciled with a critical baryon density $\Omega_B \sim 1$. Although the various studies are in good agreement with each other, the ignorance of the exact values of many QCD parameters lead to corresponding uncertainties in the results.

3 Calculations from lattice QCD

Due to the lack of appropriate models and/or experimental knowledge of the quark-hadron transition, thermodynamic parameters of the transition have to be calculated directly from the underlying theory, which means that one has to consider QCD at the transition temperature. At very high physical temperature QCD can be treated by perturbation theory because the separation of quarks will be small and the effective coupling between quarks and gluons will be governed by the asymptotic freedom of QCD. However, as has been pointed out by Linde [18], perturbation theory will brake down at $O(g^6)$ (here g is the QCD coupling constant) due to the infrared problem of the massless Yang-Mills theory. Therefore nonperturbative calculational techniques such as Monte Carlo simulations of the latticized theory are the only known way to get reliable information on the hadron transition.

After discretizing the QCD action on a 4-dimensional hypercubic lattice the theory can be quantized due to Feynman's path integral formalism, where the lattice cutoff $\Lambda = \frac{1}{a}$ (a is the lattice spacing) regularizes the infrared singularities [19, 20]. The path integral is then formally equivalent to a partition function in statistical mechanics and can be treated by nonperturbative methods. To remove the cutoff the continuum limit has to be performed at a second order phase transition of the equivalent statistical mechanical model, where the relevant scale on the lattice, the correlation length, diverges. In practice one can not reach this limit in simulations, but this is also not necessary because an ansatz of asymptotic scaling is enough to extrapolate reliably with the renormalization group to the continuum limit.

The most general method to calculate expectation values of the latticized theory is the numerical Monte Carlo simulation method. There, in addition to the discretization, the space-time dimensions have to be restricted to a finite volume. The difficulties in lattice simulations are therefore to keep the lattice volumes large enough compared to the correlation length, so that finite size effects are under control with

α/T_c^3			
ref.	$N_t = 2$	$N_t = 4$	$N_t = 6$
23	0.08(2)		
24,25	0.12(2)	0.027(4)	
26	0.139(4)		
28	0.092(4)	0.025(4)	
30		0.029(2)	0.022(4)

Table 1: *The surface tension in quenched QCD calculated with different methods on lattices with different time extent N_t .*

finite size scaling theories.

Finite physical temperatures can be taken into account (as in perturbation theory) by taking finite lattice extensions in the time-direction. In finite temperature lattice calculations, however, the number of lattice points N_t in the time direction have to be large enough to be in the asymptotic scaling region of the observables under investigation. Whether this can be realized is mainly a question of the available computer time and how fast the scaling of the observables sets in.

Monte Carlo simulations of lattice QCD have established a phase transition between a chiral symmetric quark-gluon plasma phase at high physical temperatures with no color confinement and the hadron phase at low temperatures where quarks are confined in hadrons and the chiral symmetry is broken spontaneously as proposed by McLarren and Svetitzky [21] (see for example [20] for details). The lattice calculations have established a first order phase transition in the quenched approximation, where the quarks are infinitely heavy and therefore only the gauge degrees of freedom have to be treated dynamically. Also, in the case of at least four flavours of dynamical light fermions lattice results indicate a weak first order phase transition [12]. Therefore, as discussed above, there exists the possibility that hadronization takes place through nucleation of hadronic droplets in a supercooled plasma. In addition, since nucleation is a dynamical process it is governed by equilibrium parameters of the transition such as the surface free energy and the latent heat, which can be calculated in lattice QCD.

3.1 The interface tension in quenched QCD

The interface tension is given by the free energy of the interface between coexisting phases normalized to the area of the interface [22],

$$\alpha = \frac{F}{A}, \quad (4)$$

and is usually given in units of the critical temperature T_c . The free energy is proportional to the logarithm of the partition function and the free energy of the interface accounts only for the small difference of the free energies of bulk phases. Therefore, the interface tension is difficult to calculate in Monte Carlo simulations. Reliable results have been derived until now only in the quenched approximation, on which we will concentrate in this subsection. The influence of dynamical fermions will be discussed in the next subsection.

Several methods have been used over the past three years to extract the surface tension in quenched QCD. Most of the results are obtained on lattices with the small time extent $N_t = 2$, but the first results on $N_t = 4$ and $N_t = 6$ lattices are now being quoted. We have collected recent results for the surface tension together in Table 1. Kajantie *et al.* [23] have used a surface tension operator derived from the partition function by derivation of the partition function with respect to the area of the interface. In this method some parameters have to be estimated by perturbative methods and thus reliability can be questioned at the transition temperature.

Potvin *et al.* [24, 25] have used integral methods, where the average action is integrated in the space of the gauge coupling parameter. The interface is thereby generated by a temperature difference of two parts of the lattice or by applying different external fields to the two sublattices. The main difficulty in this principally exact method is the extrapolation of the numerical results to the zero difference limit of the temperatures or the external fields of the sublattices. This method has been recently used to calculate the surface tension in simulations of $N_t = 4$ lattices [25].

An elegant transfermatrix method has been applied to quenched QCD in [26]. In this method finite size effects of the spectrum of states are used to extract the surface tension. With this method very precise results have been obtained for $N_t = 2$ lattices; however, due to the lack of global updating algorithms it has not been applied to lattices with larger time extents.

The most recent results have been derived by an histogram method proposed some time ago by Binder [27], where finite size effects in histograms of different operators due to interface effects are used to calculate the surface tension. The reason for a renaissance of this method is that the recently proposed multicanonical algorithm produces more statistics of interface configurations and that the analysis method is easy to apply to existing high statistical data of the QCDPAX collaboration. Grossmann and Laursen [28] have analysed multicanonical data on $N_t = 2$ lattices with finite size formulas, where fluctuations of the interface have been taken into account by a capillary wave model and interfacial interactions have been reduced by the use of rectangular lattices. These authors have also analysed $N_t = 4$ data of the QCDPAX collaboration [29] with the capillary wave improved finite size formulas. Preliminary analysis of the QCDPAX data by Iwasaki *et al.* [30] lead to preliminary estimates for $N_t = 6$ data also.

Although the scattering of the $N_t = 2$ results show how difficult the extraction of the surface tension is, the data indicate at least the order of magnitude of α to be expected at the finite temperature phase transition of gluonic matter. The decrease of the values with increasing N_t indicate, however, that the region of asymptotic scaling has not yet been reached.

Lattice results for the latent heat at the finite temperature phase transition in quenched QCD can be estimated from [29] to be $L/T_c^4 = 3.10(6)$ on the $N_t = 4$ lattice and $L/T_c^4 = 1.98(5)$ on the $N_t = 6$ lattice. With the largest value of the surface tension on $N_t = 2$ lattices together with the lowest estimate of $150 MeV$ for the transition temperature and $L/T_c^4 = 1.98$ for the latent heat, we obtain an estimate for an upper bound on the average distance between nucleating centers (using formula (3)) of $l \approx 0.93m$. However, with the estimate of $\alpha/T_c^3 = 0.025$ on $N_t = 4$ lattices, which is closer to the continuum limit, and with the same values of L and T_c as used above, we obtain the more realistic estimate of $l \approx 0.07m$. Therefore the average distance of nucleating centers is likely to be smaller than the diffusion length of protons ($\sim 0.5m$) and neutrons ($\sim 30m$), so that inhomogeneities created at the finite temperature phase transition of pure gluonic matter are washed out by the time primordial nucleosynthesis sets in. These conclusions are consistent with those of Ref. [10].

Also a large fraction of supercooling seem to be unlikely in quenched QCD. At the finite temperature phase transition of the pure SU(3) gauge theory three different deconfinement phases can coexist with the confinement phase, because the Z(3) center symmetry of the SU(3) gauge symmetry is spontaneously broken at $T > T_c$ [21]. As pointed out in [26] it is then most likely that a layer of the confined phase will completely wet the network of interfaces between deconfinement phases, which is rather different to the bubble nucleation scenario. However, this is only true in pure gluonic matter.

3.2 The influence of dynamical fermions on the hadronization

Although the quenched approximation of QCD can give a rough idea of the behavior of strongly interacting matter, the influence of the fermion dynamics has to be taken into account in a real world QCD calculation. Unfortunately the simulation of dynamical fermions is not only beset with technical difficulties but is also very computer time consuming, so that these studies have until now not reached the quality of quenched simulations.

Although it has not yet been demonstrated that there exists a finite temperature phase transition with a realistic fermion spectrum (see [31] for a discussion), it is now widely accepted that in full QCD a weak first order phase transition also exists with at least two light and one not-too heavy quark flavours. The transition temperature is, however, flavour dependent and drops from the above quoted 200MeV in the pure gauge theory to $T_c \approx 100\text{MeV}$ for four degenerate quark flavours [12]. The quark degrees of freedom also breaks the $Z(3)$ symmetry of the pure $SU(3)$ Lagrangian, so that complete wetting will no longer inhibit supercooling. It has been estimated by Ignatius *et al.* [32] that a metastable $Z(3)$ phase will convert into a stable one by a temperature of $T \approx 10\text{TeV}$ around 10^{-13} sec after the big bang.

Lattice results for the surface tension with dynamical fermions are not yet available. The only simulations of Markum *et al.* [33] lead to an inconsistent negative value of the surface tension and show only that it seems not to be considerably larger than in the quenched approximation.

On the other hand, the transition is weaker than in the quenched approximation leading to a larger correlation length and a smaller latent heat. Together with the reduction of the critical temperature, these factors might lead to a larger average separation of nucleating centers as indicated by Eq.(3). Whether these would result in significant inhomogeneities by the time primordial nucleosynthesis sets in is unclear however. More calculations on the lattice with dynamical fermions need to be done.

4 Conclusions

Original studies, based on a simple two-zone model in which back diffusion of neutrons are neglected during nucleosynthesis suggested that a $\Omega \sim 1$ model might be consistent with light element observations. The importance of neutron diffusion during nucleosynthesis was emphasised [7], leading to numerical codes treating nucleosynthesis and diffusion simultaneously [13, 14, 34]. Neutron diffusion also leads to an overestimation of the neutron number density in the low density-region in a simple two-zone model, resulting in more realistic multi-zone calculations [13, 14]. These calculations led to upper limits on Ω_B lower than the critical value. Finally, a large nuclear reaction network including very neutron rich nuclei and heavy elements were included in the multi-zone calculations [34] (using various values of the QCD parameters), leading to a considerably lower upper limit on Ω_B and ensuring that an $\Omega_B \sim 1$ model is inconsistent with the observed abundances of the light elements even if the universe is inhomogeneous. Recently [35] the yields of primordial light elements from baryon-inhomogeneous BBN have been recalibrated using new 'improved' diffusion coefficients calculated from relativistic kinetic theory, with the result that the yields previously obtained using more crudely derived diffusion coefficients (e.g., Refs. [5, 6, 7, 9, 13, 16, 14]) remain virtually unchanged. The various results are essentially consistent and in basic agreement with Reeves' [2] quoted limits of $0.01 < \Omega_B < 0.2$ (a range which is somewhat larger than that in the standard BBN scenario) based on the then allowable ranges of the QCD parameters.

To date there are no lattice calculations available with a realistic fermion spectrum close to the continuum limit, so that definitive conclusions for the quark-hadron transition cannot be made yet. Further research in this field is necessary to get a better understanding of the phase transitions in the early universe. However, *in the models studied so far there is no evidence at all for a strong supercooling and a cosmologically relevant scale for the inhomogeneities created at the quark-hadron transition.*

The most detailed studies of the surface tension have been done in the quenched approximation of QCD, where the fermion dynamics have been neglected. In this approximation only a small surface tension was found. Although the results are still not in the asymptotic scaling region close to the continuum limit, the trend is that for larger lattices even smaller values of the surface tension result, leading to scales of inhomogeneities which are irrelevant for primordial nucleosynthesis.

With dynamical fermions included no value for the surface tension has so far been extracted. However, the lattice calculation indicates that the phase transition is weaker than in the quenched approximation. A strong increase in the surface tension seems not to be likely, but the latent heat can drop significantly with the consideration of dynamical quarks. However, it has not been demonstrated yet that this, together

with the decrease of the transition temperature, could lead to an increase in the scale of inhomogeneities, which would then affect primordial nucleosynthesis. Indeed, it has been argued that this possibility is unlikely [9, 10].

Acknowledgement

This work was supported, in part, by the Natural Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

References

- [1] J. Yang, M.S. Turner, G. Steigman, D.N. Schramm and K. Olive, *Astrophys. J.* **281**, 493 (1984).
- [2] H. Reeves, *Physics Reports* **201**, 335 (1990).
- [3] E. Witten, *Phys. Rev. D* **30**, 272 (1984).
- [4] J.H. Applegate and C. Hogan, *Phys. Rev. D* **30**, 3037 (1985); J.H. Applegate, C. Hogan and R.J. Sherrer, *Phys. Rev. D* **35**, 1151 (1987).
- [5] J.H. Applegate, C. Hogan and R.J. Sherrer, *Astrophys. J.* **329**, 572 (1988).
- [6] C.R. Alcock, G.M. Fuller and G.J. Mathews, *Astrophys. J.* **320**, 439 (1987).
- [7] R.A. Melaney and W.A. Fowler, *Astrophys. J.* **333**, 14 (1988).
- [8] K. Kajantie and H. Kuri-Suonio, *Phys. Rev. D* **34** 1719 (1986).
- [9] B.S. Meyer, C.R. Alcock, G.J. Mathews and G.M. Fuller, *Phys. Rev. D* **43**, 1079 (1991).
- [10] B. Banerjee and R.V. Gavai, *Phys. Letts. B* **293**, 157 (1992).
- [11] H. Satz, 1987, in *Proc. Strasbourg Symp. on Quark-Hadron Phase Transition* (1987).
- [12] R.V. Gavai, S. Gupta, A. Irbäck, F. Karsch, S. Meyer, B. Petersson, H. Satz and H.W. Wyld, *Phys. Lett. B* **241**, 567 (1990).
- [13] H. Kurki-Suonio, *Phys. Rev. D* **37**, 2104 (1988); H. Kurki-Suonio, R.A. Matzner, J.M. Centrella, T. Rothman and J.R. Wilson, *Phys. Rev. D* **38**, 1091 (1988); H. Kurki-Suonio, R.A. Matzner, K.A. Olive and D.N. Schramm, *Astrophys. J.* **353**, 406 (1990).
- [14] G.J. Mathews, B.S. Meyer, C.R. Alcock and G.M. Fuller, *Astrophys. J.* **358**, 36 (1990).
- [15] H. Kurki-Suonio and R.A. Matzner, *Phys. Rev. D* **39**, 1046 (1989). H. Reeves, J. Richer, K. Sato and N. Terasawa, *Astrophys. J.* **355**, 18 (1990).
- [16] K. Sato and N. Terasawa, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **80** 468 (1988); *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **81** (1989) 254; *Phys. Rev. D* **39**, 2893 (1989).
- [17] A.M. Boesgaard and G. Steigman, *Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **23** 319 (1985).
- [18] A.D. Linde, *Phys. Lett. B* **96** 289 (1980).
- [19] K.G. Wilson, *Phys. Rev. B* **4**, 3184 (1971).
- [20] H.J. Rothe, *Lattice Gauge Theory: An Introduction*, World Scientific, Singapore, (1992).
- [21] L.D. McLarren and B. Svetitsky, *Phys. Rev. D* **24**, 450 (1981).
- [22] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifschitz, *Statistical Physics*, 3rd ed. ‘Pergamon, New York, 1980’.

- [23] K. Kajantie and L. Kärkkäinen, Phys. Lett. B **214**, 595 (1988); K. Kajantie, L. Kärkkäinen, and K. Rummukainen, Nucl. Phys. B **333**, 100 (1990); Nucl. Phys. B **357**, 693 (1991); L. Kärkkäinen, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **17**, 185 (1990); K. Rummukainen, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **17**, (1990).
- [24] J. Potvin and C. Rebbi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 3062 (1989); Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **17** 223 (1990); S. Huang, J. Potvin, C. Rebbi and S. Sanielevici, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 2863 (1990); Errata Phys. Rev. D **43**, 2056 (1991); R. Brower, S. Huang, J. Potvin, C. Rebbi and J. Ross, Preprint BUHEP-91-22 (1991); R. Brower, S. Huang, J. Potvin and C. Rebbi, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **17**, 223 (1990); Preprint BUHEP-92-3 (1992).
- [25] R. Brower, S. Huang, J. Potvin and C. Rebbi, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 2703 (1992).
- [26] B. Grossmann, M.L. Laursen, U.-J. Wiese and T. Trappenberg, Nucl. Phys. B. **397**, 431 (1993); T. Trappenberg, Int. J. Mod. Phys. C **3**, No.5 947 (1992).
- [27] K. Binder, Z. Phys. B **43** 119 (1981); Phys. Rev. A **25**, 1699 (1982).
- [28] B. Grossmann and M.L. Laursen, Preprint HLRZ 93-7 (1993); see also B. Grossmann, M.L. Laursen, U.-J. Wiese and T. Trappenberg, Phys. Lett. B **293**, 175 (1992); Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **30**, 869 (1993).
- [29] M. Fukugita, M. Okawa and U. Ukawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 1768 (1989); Nucl. Phys. B **337**, 181 (1989); Y. Iwasaki, K. Kanaya, T. Yoshie, T. Hoshino, T. Shirakawa, Y. Oyanagi, S. Ichii and T. Kawai, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 4657 (1992).
- [30] L. Kärkkäinen, private communication; Y. Iwasaki, K. Kanaya, L. Kärkkäinen and K. Rummukainen, publication in preparation.
- [31] F.R. Brown, F.P. Butler, H. Chen, N.H. Chris, Z. Dong, W. Schaffer, L.I. Unger and A. Vaccarino, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 2491 (1990).
- [32] J. Ignatius, K. Kajantie and K. Rummukainen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 737 (1992).
- [33] M. Hackel, M. Faber, H. Markum and M. Müller, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 5648 (1992).
- [34] K. Sato and N. Terasawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. (Letters) **81**, 1085 (1989); Ap. J. Letts. **362**, L47 (1990); Physica Scripta **T36**, (1991).
- [35] H. Kurki-Suonio, M.B. Aufderheide, F. Graziani, G.J. Mathews, B. Banerjee, S.M. Chitre and D.N. Schramm, Phys. Letts. B **289**, 221 (1992).